Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/981,221	PURBRICK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Callie E. Shosho	1714
All Participants:	Status of Application	: Allowed
(1) <u>Callie E. Shosho</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Chris Konkol</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: August 18-19 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1,12,15,16		
Prior art documents discussed: Sekiguchi (U.S. 6,485,812)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. Part I ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	he examiner will provide a に	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Konkol. The amendment to claim 1 was made to replace "are capable of reacting" claim limitation with the positive claim limitation "react". The first amendment to claim 12 regarding the ratio of inorganic oxide to polymeric crosslinking agent was made to correct an inadvertant error by applicants whereby claim 12 recited two different ratios of inorganic oxide to polymeric crosslinking agent. The amendments to each of claims 12 and 15 was made to avoid any potential rejections against these claims using Sekiguchi. Claim 16 was cancelled given that it was identical to present claim 4.